

REMARKS

Claims 2-6, 10, 11, 13, 18-20, and 22-26, 28, 29 and 31-33 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 28, 29, 31 and 32 have been amended, and claim 25 has been canceled. Applicant reserves the right to file one or more continuation applications directed to the canceled claims. New independent claims 34-36 have been added. As a result, claims 2-6, 10, 11, 13, 18-20, 22-24, 26, 28, 29 and 31-36 are pending for examination with claims 3, 4 and 34-36 being independent claims. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of these amendments and the following arguments.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action dated August 29, 2006, claims 4-6, 10, 13, 18, 20, 25, 28, 29 and 31-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Popovich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,337,759).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 4. Independent claim 4 is directed to an insert for placement in a door light. The insert includes a substantially planar top surface defining a plane, and a raised portion at least partially surrounded by the top surface. The raised portion includes at least two features which are raised with respect to the plane of the top surface, and the raised portion has a substantially uniform configuration, where the at least two features on the raised portion include at least two raised concentric rings. The insert further includes an outer edge of the raised portion, and at least one *substantially linear truncated side provided on a portion of the outer edge and interrupting at least an outermost concentric ring, such that the at least an outermost concentric ring is incomplete*, where the truncated side is substantially perpendicular to the planar top surface.

Popovich is directed to a dome-shaped radiant energy concentrator for heating a fluid reservoir, such as a water pipe. Radiant energy passes through an entry face 12 on the concentrator which is made up of stair-stepped faces 12a and 12b and travels out through the exit face 13 towards the target 15. As discussed in Popovich, the entry face 12 and exit face 13 are configured to concentrate radiant energy in the form of rays 16a, 16b towards the target 15 inside the device.

Popovich fails to teach or suggest an insert including at least one substantially linear truncated side, as recited in independent claim 4. More specifically, claim 4 recites a substantially linear truncated side *on a portion of the outer edge and interrupts at least an outermost concentric ring, such that at least an outermost concentric ring is incomplete*. Based on the annotated copy of FIG. 10A in Popovich accompanying the Office Action, it appears that the Examiner is relying on one of the stepped faces on the top surface of the conical body means 440 to disclose this truncation. However, FIG. 10A does not illustrate a truncated side as claimed. FIG. 10A illustrates a stepped configuration on the exterior surface of a conical element, body means 440. There are no truncated sides on body means 440. The stepped faces are all circular in configuration if one looks down on the conical body means 440 or if one takes a cross-section perpendicular to target 15. None of the circular stepped faces of Popovich is interrupted such that a full ring is not present. In Popovich the outermost ring forms a complete circle and is not interrupted. Moreover, there is no linear side of the body means 440 as the body means 440 is conical in shape and has a circular cross-section throughout.

For at least these reasons, claim 4 is patentable over Popovich. Claims 5, 13, 18 and 20 all depend from claim 4 and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 25 has been canceled to further the prosecution of this application. As discussed in more detail below, dependent claims 28, 29 and 31-33 have been amended to depend from new independent claim 34 rather than now canceled independent claim 25.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action dated August 29, 2006, claims 2-3, 19 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Popovich. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Popovich in view of Aho (U.S. Patent No. 5,097,375), and claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Popovich in view of Cooper, Jr. (U.S. Patent Reissue No. Re 25,017).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 3. Independent claim 3 is directed to an insert for placement in a door light. The insert includes a substantially planar top

surface defining a plane, and a raised portion at least partially surrounded by the top surface. The raised portion includes at least two features which are raised with respect to the plane of the top surface. The raised portion has a substantially uniform configuration, and the raised portion defines an upper surface. The at least two features on the raised portion include at least two raised concentric rings substantially centered on the insert. The insert also includes a substantially planar bottom surface spaced apart from and disposed substantially in parallel in relation to the top surface, and a recessed portion at least partially surrounded by the bottom surface. The recessed portion includes at least two features which are recessed with respect to the bottom surface, and the recessed portion defines a lower surface. *The at least two features on the recessed portion include at least two recessed concentric rings which substantially correspond in shape and size to the at least two raised concentric rings on the raised portion, and the distance between the upper surface of the raised portion and the lower surface of the recessed portion is substantially uniform throughout.*

Popovich is discussed above. The Office Action states that the distance between the upper surface of the raised portion and the lower surface of the recessed portion is substantially uniform throughout and points to FIG. 10A in Popovich. However, FIG. 10A in Popovich does not disclose a configuration where the recessed portion substantially corresponds in shape and size to the raised portion such that the distance between the upper and lower surface is substantially uniform. By contrast, in Popovich, the stepped upper surface is configured differently from the angled facet bottom surface such that the distance between these two surfaces varies along the surface of body means 440, and is thus not substantially uniform throughout, as recited in claim 3.

Claim 3 recites an insert for placement in a door that is configured such that the insert looks substantially similar on each side. By contrast, Popovich is directed to a solar heat concentrator, where the angle and configuration of the upper and lower surface affect how rays are diverted and thus concentrated. There is no teaching or suggestion to modify the concentrator in Popovich such that the distance between the upper and lower surfaces are substantially uniform throughout as recited in claim 3. In fact, if Popovich were so modified, facets 444 would not achieve their desired function to “bend rays 443 through 90 degrees onto cylindrical target 441”. (Popovich, Col. 8, lines 17-19). Rather, the rays of light would be directed downwardly, parallel to the target 441 and not

toward it, defeating the purpose of the lens. Thus, Popovich actually teaches away from such a modification.

For at least these reasons, claim 3 is patentable over Popovich. Claims 2, 11 and 22-24 depend from claim 3 and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 19 and 26 depend from claim 4 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 4, as discussed above.

Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicant has also added new independent claims 34-36 to further define the invention. Support for the new claims may be found at least on page 4, lines 23-30, on page 6, lines 11-33, on page 8, line 11- page 9, line 20, on page 9, line 25-29, on page 10, line 23, and in Figs. 6-10.

New independent claim 34 is directed to the combination of a door and an insert for placement in the door. The insert includes a substantially planar top surface defining a plane, and a raised portion at least partially surrounded by the top surface. The raised portion includes at least two features which are raised with respect to the plane of the top surface. The raised portion has a substantially uniform configuration. The at least two features on the raised portion include at least two raised concentric rings, defining an inner ring and an outer ring, where the maximum height of the inner ring is greater than the maximum height of the outer ring. The maximum height of the raised portion is at the center of the concentric rings, and the maximum height of each concentric ring decreases progressively towards the outer edge of the raised portion.

Popovich and the cited prior art fail to disclose or suggest the combination of a door and the above-described insert for placement in the door. Popovich, as noted above, relates to a solar heat collector for a water pipe and is not taught or suggested to be placed in a door.

Dependent claims 28-32 have been amended to depend from new claim 34 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 34.

New independent claims 35 is also directed to a combination of a door and an insert for placement in the door. The insert recited in claim 35 is similar to the insert claimed in independent claim 3 where a recessed portion includes at least two recessed concentric rings which substantially

correspond in shape and size to the at least two raised concentric rings on a raised portion, and where the distance between the upper surface of the raised portion and the lower surface of the recessed portion is substantially uniform throughout.

Claim 35 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 3. Furthermore, Popovich and the cited prior art fail to disclose or suggest the combination of a door and the above-described insert for placement in the door as recited in claim 35.

New independent claim 36 is also directed to a combination of a door and an insert for placement in the door. The insert recited in claim 36 is similar to the insert claimed in independent claim 4 including at least one substantially linear truncated side provided on a portion of an outer edge and interrupting at least an outermost concentric ring such that the at least an outermost concentric ring is incomplete, where the truncated side is substantially perpendicular to a planar top surface.

Claim 36 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 4. Furthermore, Popovich and the cited prior art fail to disclose or suggest the combination of a door and the above-described insert for placement in the door as recited in claim 36.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: November 29, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Shannon Pratt
Lawrence M. Green, Esq., Registration No.: 29,384
Shannon Pratt, Registration No.: 55,548
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
(617) 646-8000